



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,608	10/21/2001	Francisco M. Galanes	M61.12-0394	7929

27366 7590 03/13/2007

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/087,608	Applicant(s) GALANES ET AL.	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-23, 25 and 27-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-23, 25 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/29/06&1/12/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 12/29/2006 and 01/12/2007 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449). However, one of the IDS documents, Document No. AF filed 01/12/2007, appears to be irrelevant to instant application.

Response to Amendment

4. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment and RCE examination both filed on 12/29/2006. The applicant(s) amended claims 1, 15 and 29, cancelled claim 26, and added new claim 34 (see the amendment: pages 2-7).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/29/2006 with respect to the claim rejection under 35 USC 102 and/or 103, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since the amended claims introduce new issue and/or change the scope of the claims. It is noted the previous cited references are still applicable to the newly amended claims for the prior art rejection (see detail below).

Claim Objections

6. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 27, it appears to depend on claim 25 and will be interpreted as so hereinafter, because the claim 26 has been cancelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-9, 11-23, 25 and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1, it claims "a computer readable medium", which is broadly interpreted as a communication media, such as signal, a carrier wave, in light of the disclosure of the specification (page 12-13). It is noted that the claimed computer readable medium referring to communication media, carrier wave, transport mechanism, transmission media, wired media,

Art Unit: 2626

wireless media, signals, does not fall within four statutory categories, so as being non-statutory subject matter. In addition, it is noted that the claimed invention, as whole, referring to a communication media itself, such as signal, or a carrier wave, does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result in a practical application.

Regarding claims 2-9 and 11-14, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 1.

Regarding claim 15, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 1.

Regarding claims 16-23, 25 and 27-28, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 15, because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 15.

Regarding claim 29, it claims "a computer implemented method", which appears, in the surface, to fall within statutory classes (i.e. a process). However, by reviewing the body of the claimed language, the claimed invention, as whole, claims nothing more than computer implemented steps, which is substantially drawn to functional descriptive material per se and falls within 35 USC 101 Judicial Exceptions, i.e. abstract idea. Further, since the claim, as whole, is functional descriptive material per se (i.e. abstract idea), it does not produce a useful, tangible, and concrete result in a practical application. Therefore, the claim, as whole, is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 30-34, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 29, because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 29.

8. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejection under 35 U.S.C 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claims 1, 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ALBAYRAK et al. (US 6,662,163 B1) hereinafter referenced as ALBAYRAK, in view of WHITE et al. (US 6,460,017 B1) hereinafter referenced as WHITE.

As per **claim 1**, ALBAYRAK discloses system and method for programming portable devices from a remote computer system (title), in client/server environment (Fig. 1), comprising:

“a set of controls configured for use on server remote from the client for defining a dialog and used to dynamically generate client side markup in accordance with the dialog”, (col. 3, lines 51-55, ‘dynamically program portable client computer’, ‘manage voice dialogs for the purpose of interacting with and guiding users in various work tasks (necessarily including the corresponding various controls)’; col. 4, lines 24-28, ‘voice browse read a VoiceXML (markup) page...and acts upon the information and instructions (also corresponding to a set of controls); col. 8, lines 1-67, ‘VoiceXML pages 250...are generated by the SHIM 242 (on server)’, ‘VoiceXML templates 252...that describes an application-specific verbal dialog (defining a dialog)’, ‘system configuration data’ including ‘the VoiceXML page currently loaded in the client (corresponding to dynamically generate client side markup)’),

“the controls comprising at least a question control for generating markup related to audible prompting of a question, and an answer control for generating markup related to a grammar for recognition”, (col. 4, lines 22-67, ‘VoiceXML ...to create audio dialogs’, ‘voice browse read a VoiceXML (markup) page...and acts upon the information and instructions (controls)’, ‘user’s voice files and application-specific grammar files (both need for speech recognition) are loaded on the client’, ‘play an audio prompt (interpreted as question control)’ and ‘wait for user to confirm (interpreted as answer control) that he completed the requested action’; Fig. 2 and col.6, lines 25-31, ‘affirmative or negative response including “yes”, “no” (corresponding to answer control)’, which further suggests that the system provides a “question” related control before this response and the “answer” control for handling this response);

“a module, which when executed on the server, generates client side markup based on the dialog [as a function of which controls are activated]” (Fig.4 and col. 8, lines 1-8, ‘system host interface module 242’; also see col. 11, lines 21-29); and

“a module configured for use on the client and when executed on the client and using the client side markup, creates a dialog [as a function of which controls are activated]”, (Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 6-64, ‘the voice browser (module used on the client) interprets voice pages received from the server...then performs (executed on client) an action based on the text response’, ‘dynamically program portable client computers, and to manage voice dialogs for the purpose of interacting with and guiding users in various work tasks’; col. 4, lines 24-2, ‘the voices browser reads a VoiceXML (markup) page’, and ‘VoiceXML was designed ... to create (generate) audio dialogs that feature digitized audio and speech recognition’).

But, ALBAYRAK does not expressly disclose “each of the controls having an attribute to indicate whether the associated control is available for activation” and the dialog “as a function of which controls are activated”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by WHITE who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses distributed voice web architecture and associated components and methods (title), and teaches that ‘an attribute of a component is information the component has’ (col. 9, lines 20-21), and provides ‘endpointer’ with attribute (or parameter): ‘active: boolean’ for reporting (indicating) the outcome of user’s utterance activation according to the related dialog steps or events (including controls) (col. 20, lines 14-64), which is broadly interpreted as the claimed a dialog as “function of which controls are activated”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify ALBAYRAK by specifically providing attribute reporting the outcome of activation for dialog steps or events, as taught by WHITE, for the purpose (motivation) of generating the prompt in response to the recognized speech and/or transmitting the prompt to the remote device (WHITE: col. 1, lines 50-53).

In addition, in another view, ALBAYRAK discloses the dialog between ‘client’ and ‘server’ and ‘voice browser interpret: page play audio prompts and wait for user’s verbal response(s)’ (Figs. 5A-5B), and teaches that ‘voice browser...follows its instructions (corresponding to controls) to carry on the application-specific dialog with user (334)’ (col. 11, lines 31-32), which suggests the system necessarily includes activation information (attribute) indicating current running tasks (controls) and operative function in response to an interactive action (activating the function, such as playing prompts or waiting an response), in order to keep normal operation for the dialog interactions; and ‘manage voice dialogs’ for ‘interacting with and

Art Unit: 2626

guiding users in various work tasks' between 'client and server computers' and 'control how the client interact with the user', and 'the server' 'servers' VoiceXML pages to voice browsers on portable client' using the WWW protocols (or HTTP)' (col. 3, line 51 to col. 4, line 10), which necessarily and/or inherently includes various elements of ML and/or VoiceXML language, including forms, controls, function calls (sub-dialog) for invoking (activate) and interacting the dialog (see detail in IDS: document No. CA). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the dialog (form and menu) and sub-dialog (function call) defined in VoiceXML are preferably used for invoking (activating) and interacting voice dialog, and to modify ALBAYRAK by specifically providing activation information (attribute) indicating current running tasks (activated controls) and operative function in response to an interactive action in the dialog by using VoiceXML, for the purpose (motivation) of performing an action based on text response converted by voice browser (ALBAYRAK: col. 3, lines 11-13).

As per **claim 15**, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

As per **claim 29**, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

10. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11, 14, 16-19, 21-23, 25, 28 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE as applied to claim 1, and further in view of ALPDEMIR (US 2002/0035474 A1).

As per **claim 2** (depending on claim 1), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE does not expressly disclose “the question control activates the answer control”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by ALPDEMIR who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses voice-interactive marketplace providing time and money saving benefits and real-time promotion publishing and feedback (title), comprising ‘natural language recognition’ that ‘listens users’ request in free form speech or extracts the command and/or data, ...asks additional questions of the users’(paragraph 220) and the interactions in the dialog including question/answer sequences (paragraphs 253-268), which suggests the system has capability of implementing the claimed “question control activates the answer control”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE by specifically providing question/answer interactions in the dialog, as taught by ALPDEMIR, for the purpose of providing greater interactive capability and/or communicating the speech-based representation of the particular data item to the external device (ALPDEMIR: col. 3, lines 1-2 and abstract).

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 2), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “a command control for generating markup related to a grammar for one of navigation in the markup, help with a task, and repeating an audible prompt”, (ALBAYRAK: col. 11, lines 31-32, ‘voice browser...follows it instructions (command control) to carry on the application-specific dialog with user (334)’; col. 4, lines 23-24, ‘voice XML(markup)...to create (generate) audio dialogs that feature digitized audio and speech recognition’; col. 4, lines 23-24, ‘repeating the telling (audio prompt-telling)’; ALPDEMIR: paragraphs 132 and 140, ‘ “help” there should desirably be some automated help (task)’ and

Art Unit: 2626

‘standard data and information formats and protocols, such as HTML, XML, and XVML (markup)’).

As per **claim 4** (depending on claim 4), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “a confirmation control for generating markup related to confirming that a recognized result is correct”, (ALBAYRAK: col. 4, lines 63-66).

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 4), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “the confirmation control is activated as a function of a confidence level or a received result”, (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 176, function of ‘confirm information {confirm()}’).

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 5), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “the confirmation control activates an accept control to accept the recognized result”, (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 191, sub-grammar “yes”).

As per **claim 8** (depending on claim 5), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “the confirmation control activates a deny control to deny the recognized result”, (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 191, sub-grammar “no”).

As per **claim 9** (depending on claim 5), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

As per **claim 11** (depending on claim 2), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR further discloses “the answer control includes a mechanism to associate a received result with one control of the set of controls”, (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 191, sub-grammar “yes” or “no”).

As per **claim 14** (depending on claim 1), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE further discloses “a second set of controls for generating markup related to visual rendering on a client”, (ALBAYRAK: col. 2, lines 19-20 and 46 and 45-46 ‘displaying ...information from XML files’ and ‘voice browser that interprets VoiceXML programs similar to the way computer users use a graphical browser (including second set of controls) that interprets HTML program’), but ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE does not expressly disclose “wherein each control of the first-mentioned set of controls is associated with at least one of the controls of the second set of controls”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by ALPDEMIR who further discloses that ‘a message is played/displayed when a caller request businesses...the right to be announced/displayed’(paragraph 85), ‘the text information from the data is converted to speech... and played backed to the caller using the caller’s devices 106’ and ‘the information database 134...can also be accessed with a display device’ including wireless phones, PDA or palmtop ...with the ability to display standard HTML’, and suggest using ‘standard data and information formats and protocols, such as HTML, XML, VXML’ (paragraphs 138-139), which suggests the system has capability of associating voice related action with text related action by using VXML, HTML or XML for playing and displaying. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE by specifically providing functionality of playing voice and displaying text (or graphics) by using VXML, HTML or XML, for the purpose of providing greater interactive capability and/or communicating the speech-based representation of the particular data item to the external device (ALPDEMIR: col. 3, lines 1-2 and abstract).

As per **claims 16-19, 21-23, 25 and 28** (depending on claim 15), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 14 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 2-5, 7-9, 11 and 14 respectively.

As per **claims 30-34** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 2-5 and 14 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 2-5 and 14 respectively.

11. Claims 6, 12-13, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR, as applied to claims 5, 11, 19, 25, and further in view of CHINN et al. (US 2002/0010715 A1) hereinafter referenced as CHINN.

As per **claim 6** (depending on claim 1), even though ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR discloses finding match of an answer (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 228) and using 'check score' function (ALPDEMIR: paragraph 176), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR does not expressly disclose "the answer control includes an attribute related to a confidence level". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHINN who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses system and method of browsing using a limited display device (title), providing accessing web content by using voice commands and markup language (paragraph 6), and teaches that 'the confidence score is a value used by the system that represents the level of certainty in recognition' and "the system may reject a request if the confidence score is below a specific threshold, or may attempt to determine with more certainty (i.e., disambiguate) a request with a confidence score that falls within a specific range' (paragraphs 186 and 222-224). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2626

the art at the time the invention was made to modify ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE and ALPDEMIR by specifically providing information (attribute) for finding a match by using confidence score, as taught by CHINN, for the purpose of representing the level of certainty in recognition (CHINN: paragraph 186).

As per **claim 12** (depending on claim 11), the rejection is based on the reason described for claim 6, because the rejection for claim 6 covers the same or similar limitations of claim 12.

As per **claim 13** (depending on claim 12), ALBAYRAK in view of WHITE, ALPDEMIR and CHINN further discloses that "the mechanism includes issuing an event related to operation of binding", (WHITE: col. 10, lines 41-47, 'an event-driven architecture' and teaches that 'events are "fired" (signaled)(read on issued) by the browser, ...or a content application').

As per **claims 20 and 27** (depending on claim 15), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 6 and 13 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 6 and 13 respectively.

Conclusion

12. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c))

Art Unit: 2626

and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria , VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
January 7, 2007


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER